

Errata

Commercial Services Plan and Environmental Assessment Lassen Volcanic National Park

An Errata sheet is necessary to address substantive comments made on the Environmental Assessment (EA). Substantive comments are those that modify the existing alternatives, propose new alternatives not previously considered, supplement, improve or modify the impact analysis, or make factual corrections. The corrections in this Errata make minor changes to the plan. They do not increase, and in some times serve to decrease the degree of impact described in the EA. The EA will not be reprinted. Changes to the text and justification are provided below.

CHANGES TO TEXT:

The following are changes to the text to reflect modifications made in response to public and agency comment. Existing text to remain is in *italics*, additions to the text are underlined and deleted text is shown in ~~strikeout~~.

Summary, 2nd paragraph

The scope of this planning effort includes all existing and potential commercial services at the park for the next 5 to 10 years.

Page 6, Purpose and Need For The Plan, 1st paragraph

This plan will provide a comprehensive guide for managing commercial services in Lassen Volcanic National Park for five to ten years.

Page 10, Services Available Outside the Park Boundary

At the time of the 2003 GMP scoping the Park heard from a number of comments that they would like to see lodging in the park. There were several lodging/motel type projects planned outside the park on the highway 44. Therefore, the decision was made in the 2003 GMP that no new lodging would be considered because adequate facilities would soon become available just outside the park boundary. McArthur Burney Falls Memorial State Park, which is 45 miles north east of the park's northwest entrance, has plans to add 24 park model cabins to their campground during the summer of 2007. The rest of these planned facilities, however, have never been completed. There was a project approved by Shasta County in the central area of Shingletown for a motel and restaurant that was never constructed. The new owners (at the time of the GMP writing) of Big Wheels said they planned to construct overnight lodging in conjunction with their business. Since then, however, the restaurant has burned down ~~and those owners have moved on.~~ and no new lodging has been constructed. Old Station continues with only one small facility. At the time of the GMP there was talk of a refurbished set of units there, but this has not been acted upon.

Page 19, Other Authorizations

~~In 1982 the NPS established the Historic Leasing Program to lease historic structures to individuals and organizations. The program was designed to spur rehabilitation and reuse of designated historic structures and federally owned lands. Any proceeds from these leases were to be used to maintain, repair, and preserve historic properties and to defray the costs of administering the leasing program. This is a commercial activity authorized by a lease.~~

Page 31, Proposed Action, Manzanita Lake

This alternative would provide the same services and operations at the same levels as described in Alternative 1 with some additions. This alternative would amend the GMP to allow low- impact lodging to be constructed in the Manzanita Lake area. ~~Forty to sixty~~ Twenty to forty tent cabins, yurts or cabins without bathrooms would be constructed in the old campground loop B (See Map 3). The lodging units would be constructed in the former campsites. Existing restrooms in the loop would be remodeled or replaced to accommodate the needs of guests. Electricity to provide lighting for the cabins would be extended through the loop to each cabin. The roads in the loop would be repaved with parking designated for each cabin. The camper services building would be replaced or remodeled and expanded at its current location to accommodate lodging check-in, camper store, showers, laundry and an expanded food service. The implementation of this lodging project would be phased in order to assess any unforeseen impacts before determining if more cabins should be put in. The first phase would include the installation of 20 lodging units, one of which would be authorized for use by the concessioner's staff as a seasonal residence. The re- paving of the road would be minimal (gravel and chip seal) and the bathroom in Old Loop B would not be improved; instead the visitors staying at the cabins would use the existing restrooms located near the camper store. No utilities would be extended through the loop to any visitor's cabin. The camper store would rent out some camping supplies that may be needed by visitors staying in the new lodging units. After one to two years of using the site and assessing the associated impacts, it would be determined if up to twenty more lodging units would be added. If and when the second set of twenty lodging units were added, the existing restrooms in the loop would be remodeled or replaced to accommodate the needs of guests, the road would get further improvements, the camper store would be improved, and long- term monitoring conducted.

In order to alleviate any concerns regarding increased use at the Manzanita Lake Day- Use area, the Reflection Lake Picnic Area would be re- opened. Reflection Lake is directly across the main park road from Manzanita Lake. The re- opening of the Reflection Lake Picnic Area was approved in the park's 2003 GMP but has not yet been implemented. The re- opening of this area would be scheduled to coincide with the opening of the new lodging and would serve to disperse the use in the Manzanita Lake developed area.

Small boat, canoe, or kayak rentals would be available on Manzanita Lake. Rental of recreational equipment such as, skis, snowshoes, and bear proof containers would be authorized. The concessioner would be authorized to rent a maximum of 10 small row boats or kayaks on Manzanita Lake. The hours of boat rentals would be limited from between 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. in order to minimize any experiential impacts to fly fishermen who typically utilize the lake in the early morning and late afternoon hours. Rental of recreational equipment such as skis, snowshoes, hiking equipment and bear proof food containers would also be authorized. The concessioner would also be authorized to provide a small private boat storage area near Manzanita Lake so that campers staying multiple days in the park may leave their private non-motorized boats near the lake and not have to shuttle them back and forth to their campsites.

Page 31, Proposed Action, Warner Valley and Drakesbad

This alternative would provide the same services and operations at the same levels as described in Alternative 1 with ~~some~~ one additions. While this alternative proposes the same basic commercial operation at Drakesbad it does include some operational changes from Alternative

1. ~~The swimming pool and shower facilities would be open to the general public, subject to capacity and health constraints, with a user fee authorized. Visitors who are not Drakesbad guests would no longer be required to also buy dinner in order to use the pool. The concession would be authorized to offer more spa services in addition to the massage therapy currently offered; however, these services would have to be provided within the existing buildings.~~ can not utilize more than the two rooms already used in the bath house for massage services and they must be appropriate and continue to serve visitor needs. Rental of recreational minimal hiking equipment and bear proof food containers would be authorized.

Page 32, Summit Lake, Devastated Area parking lot, ...

This alternative would authorize a mobile food service, similar to that described above. Also, a small number of winter- use yurts could be erected by a commercial entity, either under concession contract or Commercial Use Authorization, at the Summit Lake developed area and at the Devastated Area parking/interpretive area for use by cross country skiers (See Map 4).

Page 43, Alternatives Considered and Rejected

~~Another site was~~ Several other sites were considered for the tent cabins under Alternative 2. This One site was east of the campground at Manzanita Lake. This site was ultimately dismissed due to the fact that it has not been previously disturbed, and other sites that have been previously disturbed were available that would result in fewer environmental impacts to the area. Another site considered was the site of the old budget cabins. This site was ultimately dismissed due to the fact that an ecological restoration project has already been implemented in this area and because there is a desire to keep all overnight use within the same area of Manzanita Lake. Furthermore, because the ecological restoration project has been implemented, there are no existing roads to build upon, no bathroom and no nearby showers. Another alternative was to put the new cabins in the existing D- Loop of the campground and re- open the Old Loop B for tent camping, essentially exchanging the camp sites currently in Loop D for campsites in the Old Loop B. This alternative was ultimately dismissed because it placed the cabins too far away from the camper store where the concessioner would most likely manage the lodging from. A close proximity to the lodging would be necessary for proper management. Another alternative was to create a new "Loop E" just past the existing Loop D. This alternative is not feasible due to the terrain in that area. Another alternative was to put cabins at Summit Lake. This alternative was dismissed because there is no previously disturbed area that could be utilized and would therefore result in greater environmental impacts. A final alternative proposed was to put the cabins near the new Southwest Visitor Center. This alternative was dismissed because not only is there no previously disturbed area to use, but the terrain in the area is not conducive to any further development. All of the land conducive to building in that area would be used by the new Visitor Center and parking lot, leaving no relatively flat areas for cabins.

Adding a surface mounted over snow cable tow for the snow play area at the Southwest entrance was considered. This would have similar impacts as rope tows used in ski areas. The National Park Service has a policy stating that no new downhill skiing facilities or associated structures are permitted. Because this would be so similar to the type of facilities that are explicitly not allowed by NPS policy, this alternative was ultimately dismissed.

Page 67, Mitigations

In order to alleviate any concerns regarding increased use at the Manzanita Lake Day- Use area, the Reflection Lake Picnic Area would be re- opened. Reflection Lake is directly across the main park road from Manzanita Lake. The re- opening of the Reflection Lake Picnic Area was approved in the park's 2003 GMP but has not yet been implemented. The re- opening of this area would be scheduled to coincide with the opening of the new lodging and would serve to spread out the use in the Manzanita Lake developed area.

Monitoring of the water quality and fish populations would be undertaken at Manzanita Lake immediately after the first year of Phase I as well as after the first year of Phase II of the low- impact lodging project.

NPS RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS

On January 17, 2007 the second plan and EA were made available for a public review period that closed on February 23, 2007. Fifty- three comment letters were received and 5 comments were received via telephone. Of the 53 comment letters, 49 were from private citizens, 3 were from government agencies and one was from the park's current concessioner. Thirty- three percent were strongly in favor of the proposal in the preferred alternative to return low- impact lodging and limited boat rentals to the Manzanita Lake area. Thirty- eight percent were opposed in some way to the proposed actions for the Manzanita Lake area, mostly because they believed it would impact their fly fishing experience. Twenty- five percent were opposed to the proposal in the preferred alternative to allow non- Drakesbad guests to utilize the pool and showers at Drakesbad. Finally, nineteen percent had general comments relating to a variety of different aspects of the plan and EA. The previous numbers add up to greater than one hundred percent because several people commented on more than one issue.

Comment: Thirty- eight percent of those who commented were opposed to the preferred alternative (alternative 2). Most of these people cited that they enjoy fly fishing at Manzanita Lake and they fear that an increase in overnight use (low- impact lodging), as well as non- motorized boat rentals, will negatively impact their fly fishing experience. Many stated that they believe there is already a large amount of use in the Manzanita Lake area and that the park cannot support more use. Specific concerns at the Manzanita Lake area included:

- If you bring more people to the area, the fly fisher's experience will be diminished
- The trout population will be damaged by increased use
- The water quality of the lake will be diminished with greater use
- More information regarding the type and number of boats to be rented is needed
- Too many people using the lake already
- The picnic tables at the day use area tend to be full
- The shores of the lake are already being negatively impacted by the current use; more use will make the impacts greater
- Inadequate parking at the Manzanita Lake day use area
- Inadequate ranger presence
- Inadequate enforcement of rules
- Inadequate camper support services such as food and groceries

Response: While the park stands by its determination in the EA that the original proposal would not have any significant impacts on the environment, several changes have been made to the plan and EA to alleviate many of the concerns listed above. The number of cabins/yurts to be put in has been reduced from 40- 60 to 20- 40. Furthermore, the implementation will be done in phases with monitoring taking place after the first season to determine if any of the predicted impacts in the EA turn out to be greater than expected. In the first phase, 20 low- impact lodging units will be put in the Old Loop B. The park will monitor the water quality as well as the fish population after the first 20 units are utilized for one summer to determine if there are any unsuspected impacts. If the impacts are not greater than expected, then the second phase will be implemented with the addition of up to 20 more units. Monitoring would continue after the second phase is implemented to again ensure that there are no unsuspected impacts.

The park recognizes that increased use at Manzanita Lake could have an impact on the fly fisher's experience. However, this lake is not managed for the sole use of fishing. While it is an excellent fishing location, it is also an excellent boating, picnicking, and hiking location. It is a multi- use lake and all visitors were considered when assessing the needs for commercial services in the area. The fish population is expected to be minimally impacted due to the fact that this is a catch and release lake. The monitoring program mentioned above, however, will be implemented to make certain that this proves to be true.

The park will also re- open the Reflection Lake picnic area in order to disperse the day use at Manzanita Lake. The Reflection Lake picnic area was once a very popular picnic site, but it was closed along with many of the other buildings in the area in the 1970s. Reflection Lake is directly across the main park road from Manzanita Lake. Re- opening this site will help to disperse the use in the area and keep any impacts from the increased use in the area to a minimum.

There will be a maximum of 10 boats available for rental. The boats will be either kayaks or row boats. They will only be rented between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. in order to avoid the peak fishing times.

The concerns regarding the appropriate numbers of rangers and interpreters in the area is a park management issue and is not relevant to a Commercial Services Plan.

Because the low- impact lodging will include a parking space for each unit, parking in the day use area should not be impacted by the increased lodging. The re- opening of the Reflection Lake picnic area will also help to disperse parking of day use users in the Manzanita Lake area.

Comment: Several people suggested alternate locations for the low- impact lodging.

Response: All of these alternatives were assessed and the reasons for their ultimate dismissal are listed above under the changes to text.

Comment: Several people commented that they preferred alternative 3 (full service lodge) because they prefer to have greater amenities such as in- room bathrooms and sit- down dining.

Response: The National Park Service strives to carry out its mission, which is to preserve unimpaired the natural and cultural resources and values of the National Park System for the enjoyment, education, and inspiration of this and future generations. In so doing, the park has chosen what it sees as a healthy balance between visitor use and resource protection for this plan. Please see the EA for more specifics regarding the increased impacts that would result from the implementation of alternative 3.

Comment: One person had a concern about light pollution that could result from the low- impact lodging.

Response: The inclusion of electricity at the Manzanita Lake cabins has been removed from the preferred alternative; therefore, light pollution will not be increased.

Comment: One person commented on their desire to see a place for private non- motorized boat storage at Manzanita Lake. They stated that when they stay at the campground for a week, they would like to be able to keep their boat near the lake so they don't have to transport it back and forth to the lake every day.

Response: The text of the plan and EA has been changed as noted above in the "changes to text" section to account for a commercial rental of space to store private boats. The rental of the space will be limited to the amount of time the person is camping or staying in the low- impact lodging. Not only will this serve the visitors better, but it will also serve to decrease the number of boat trailers parked at the day use parking lot as those trailers can remain parked in the campground during the visitor's stay.

Comment: One person felt that scientists still do not have a good grasp on what caused the Chaos Jumbles and questioned the safety of putting cabins in the area.

Response: This concern was adequately addressed on page 9 of the EA.

Comment: Twenty- five percent of those commenting expressed strong opposition to the proposal in the preferred alternative to allow non- Drakesbad guests to use the pool and showers.

Response: After consideration of these comments and further investigation into the capacity of the pool, it was determined that the use of the pool and showers by Drakesbad guests alone already puts these amenities at their capacity. Therefore, these proposals have been removed from the plan and EA.

Comment: One person voiced concern that the type of recreational equipment to be rented at Drakesbad was not specified in the EA and therefore the impacts could not be assessed.

Response: The text of the EA has been changed to more specifically define recreational equipment as “minimal hiking equipment.”

Comment: Several people expressed their desire to not have any spa services at Drakesbad. They stated that the facilities at Drakesbad are limited and that they did not wish to have any further use of the already- cramped bath house for spa services.

Response: The text of the EA has been changed to specify that any increased spa services may not utilize any more space than that already used for massages at Drakesbad.

Comment: The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) sent a comment pertaining to the Park’s responsibility for taking floodplains into consideration when performing construction.

Response: All of Lassen Volcanic National Park lies within either Zones C or D, according to the Flood Insurance Rate Maps. Zones C and D are both areas where FEMA has determined there to be no flood hazards. Therefore, no mitigations are required for flood protection.

Comment: The California Regional Water Quality Board sent a letter regarding waste discharge requirements and the limits that have been established for wastewater discharge flow rates to the leachfields at Manzanita Lake. They required that the park complete a Report of Waste Discharge (ROWD) 140 days before any projected increase in wastewater disposal as a result of expansion activities.

Response: An addition of 20- 40 low- impact lodging units will not cause the wastewater discharge to approach the flow rate limits that have been set. The park will submit a ROWD at least 140 days prior to the implementation of the lodging.

Comment: Several people commented that they wished to see the park improve its RV sites.

Response: The park is taking these comments into consideration; however, they do not fall within the scope of this Commercial Services Plan because the RV spaces are managed by the park and not by a commercial contract.

Comment: One person was concerned about the amount of time the mobile concessions could remain in one area. They were concerned that a mobile unit would essentially be permanently parked in a parking lot.

Response: It will be clearly written in the concession contract that the unit is to be mobile and is not permitted to remain in any one area for a significant amount of time.

Comment: One person voiced their disagreement with the statement in the EA that “[the new owners (at the time of the GMP writing) of Big Wheels said they planned to construct overnight lodging in conjunction with their business. Since then, however, the restaurant has burned down and those owners have moved on.” They stated that they had seen in the *Redding Record Searchlight* that there had been some progress toward possibly re- building Big Wheels.

Response: While the statement that the owners had moved on is, indeed, incorrect, the fact that Big Wheels has not been re- built remains true. We have changed the text of the EA as stated above in the “changes to text” section to more accurately represent the current situation with Big Wheels.

Comment: One person commented that we had omitted the plans to put some cabins at the McArthur Burney Falls Memorial State Park.

Response: This was an oversight and has been added to the text of the EA as noted above in the “changes to text” section.

Comment: The park’s current concessioner suggested adding a surface mounted over snow cable tow for the snow play area at the Southwest entrance.

Response: This would be in the same line and have similar impacts as rope tows used in ski areas. The National Park Service has a policy stating that no new downhill skiing facilities or associated structures are permitted. Because this would be so similar to the type of facilities that are explicitly not allowed by NPS policy, this alternative was ultimately dismissed. Text to this effect has been added as noted above in the “changes to text” section.